"My name is Christian, my surname is Catholic." – St. Pacian

INTERDVM*

"Increase our faith." – Luke 17:5

A journal published now and then by Patrick Henry Omlor

Box R, Menlo Park, Calif. 94025 JANUARY 6, 1970 Issue No. 1

INSIGHTS INTO HERESY

1. REVIEWING THE BASIC DEFINITIONS-- More and more frequently nowadays the word heresy seems to keep cropping up in our conversations and in our reading material. Most informed Catholics have a reasonably accurate idea of what heresy is, even though not too many may be familiar with St. Thomas' definition of it as "a species of unbelief belonging to those who profess the Christian faith, but corrupt its dogmas."(1) The common understanding is that heresy is a denial of some truth(s) or dogma(s) which the Church proposes for our belief and to which we must fully assent in order to be saved. Such a denial is by definition a heinous affront to Almighty God, Who is Truth, and an attack upon His Church which His Divine Son founded as the Ark of Salvation which teaches us the truth and enables us to attain everlasting happiness. Though so sturdily built by these Divine Hands, this Ark has ever been the prey of the mutineers aboard, for always it is from within that heresies are born. It is Satan, the Father of Lies, who begets all heresies; but the midwives and the wet nurses are to be found among "those who profess the Christian faith" (as St. Thomas says), principally theologians, bishops and priests.

Heresy may be material or formal. A material heretic is one who adheres to error because of inculpable ignorance, mistaken judgment, or a failure to comprehend dogmas adequately. Inasmuch as free choice is absent, the material heretic does not deliberately assault the Church, and therefore there is no sinfulness attached. In formal heresy, on the other hand, what comes into play is the will, which inclines and directs the intellect to cling to that which the Church declares to be false. Men become formal heretics because of their pride of intellect, or their tendency to rely too heavily on their own lights and insights, or their misguided religious zeal, or perhaps their delusions of being great religious leaders or "reformers." The mark of formal heresy is pertinacity, the obstinate refusal to recant one's errors even after their deviation from the teaching of the Church has been clearly pointed out. Heresy and humility are mortal enemies. Both cannot survive together in one and the same man; ultimately the one must destroy the other.

*****

2. GETTING A CLOSER LOOK AT HERESY -- Just knowing some definitions really does not suffice to give one a vivid understanding of what heresy is. "Scratch a Russian," said Napoleon, "and you will find a Tartar."(2) Without necessarily espousing this opinion of Russians in general, we can nevertheless accept the principle, because in order to see what underlies heresy a little "scratching" must be done. "Freedom of choice" and the "fundamental God-given right to choose" this or that or the other thing have become standard pieces of demagogic equipment for politicians, "liberal" editors, and revolutionaries in general. Now this is the very same stuff heresies are made of, for heresy always involves a choosing. The Catholic Encyclopedia explains it thus: "The right Christian faith consists in giving one's voluntary assent to Christ in all that truly belongs to His teaching...the deposit of faith...the sum total of truths revealed in Scripture and Tradition. The believer accepts the whole deposit as proposed by the Church; the heretic accepts only such parts of it as commend themselves to his own approval." (3) Heresy, then, is an abuse of freedom of choice.

No one, I think, has explained this idea more clearly than Fr. Denis Fahey: "Heresy, as its Greek original proclaims, means selecting and choosing. It involves in its very essence a rupture of the harmonious equilibrium of two truths, both of which are taught in their purity by the Catholic Church. Heresy takes one aspect of the full harmonious synthesis of the Divine Plan and exaggerates it till the resultant affirmation involves the negation of the complementary aspect. It is the partial truth contained in a heresy which obtains acceptance for the error therein involved, because the human mind is meant for truth and cannot embrace error as such. What the Catholic Church condemns is, needless to say, the error or negation, not the affirmation."(4)

In the above explanation there are four key ideas: (1) Heresy involves two truths which, although distinct from one another, are related to one another in some way. (2) The heretic does not necessarily take the "negative approach." He is usually affirming something which in itself is absolutely true, namely, one of the two truths. (3) His affirmation becomes so for-

*in·ter'·dum adv. now and then, occasionally.
(Collins Latin-English Dictionary)

cible and overemphasized that gradually some aspects of this one truth become exaggerated so that the other truth begins to be deemphasized and then eventually altogether denied. (4) It is the partial truth of what the heretic is saying that gains him a following, because the human mind (enfeebled though it is by Original Sin) still, for the most part, is capable of recognizing and rejecting unadulterated error.

*****

3. SEEING SOME EXAMPLES

"Americanism (the heresy)," Fr. Fahey points out, "is not condemned on account of its assertion of the necessity of the active and social virtues, but on account of its negation of the interior virtues of self-denial, humility, obedience. It is not judged worthy of reproof on account of its affirmation of the beauty of the natural virtues, but on account of its negation of the splendour of the supernatural ones."(5)

The doctrine of Original Sin and the dogma of the Immaculate Conception : these truths are both mysteries, and they are related to each other. Should we affirm the first truth (Original Sin) to the extent that we actually distort some aspect of it by exaggeration, we might end up questioning the Immaculate Conception. Suppose, for example, that we dwell one-sidedly on this sole aspect : Original Sin by its very nature is a sin of the race and must be universal in its scope. The whole human race by necessity inherited this sin from Adam, etc. Analyzing, scrutinizing and exaggerating this one single aspect (its universality by necessity), we might begin to wonder how Mary's being preserved from Original Sin does not somehow pull the rug out from under this aspect, which we have become so fond of dwelling upon. Original Sin is an affair of the race--this we know beyond a doubt! --, and if Mary was indeed a human being she must certainly have inherited this sin. If she didn't, then she must not have been purely human but quasi-divine (and this is just one other way of falling into error). Such is the perplexity of the man who, when dealing with mysteries, relies on reason alone unaided by faith.

Similarly, one could overemphasize the second truth, the Immaculate Conception, to the extent that he might end up denying some aspect of Original Sin. An atheist will admit that Mary was conceived without Original Sin, simply because to his way of thinking there isn't any such thing.

*****

4. TAKING SOME PRECAUTIONS

If starting out just affirming truths can so readily lead ultimately to heresy, one might wonder if the safest course isn't simply to stop studying the truths of our faith, or at least to avoid delving too deeply into them. Quite the contrary! Always, however, we must bear in mind that many of these truths are wrapped in mysteries. As our faith deepens, our understanding of these mysteries becomes greater; that is the key. The Apostles came to realize this, and their plea: "Lord, increase our faith"(6) is a most excellent ejaculation which we ourselves would do well to repeat often. (Conversely, it is also a fact that as one's faith diminishes, so does his grasp of mysteries; that again is a key, the key to what is happening in high places in the Church today.)

Never will we stray from the sound teaching of the Church if we rely upon the Holy Ghost, Mary the Queen of Truth, and our special patron saints to aid us in our study. Always thinking in consonance with what the Church teaches, always assenting to what the Church demands, always following the sound Doctors approved by the Church : these are our safeguards.

On some mysteries it is advisable not to meditate too much. Many spiritual guides, for example, counsel not to ponder too inquiringly or too frequently on the mystery of predestination, especially if a person has a tendency to be scrupulous. And regarding transubstantiation, the Catechism of the Council of Trent warns: "But, in accordance with the principle very often repeated by the Fathers, the faithful are to be admonished not to inquire too curiously into the manner in which that change may be made, for it defies our powers of conception, nor have we any example of it in natural changes, nor in the work of creation itself. The change is to be learned by faith (emphasis added); the manner of that change is not to be made a subject of too curious inquiry. But...pastors will...fortify the minds of the faithful by reminding them that 'no word shall be impossible with God' (Luke:1,37)."(7)

We must, moreover, never lose sight of the fact that the Father of Heresies always is attempting to sow the seeds of error and doubt in the minds of good Catholics. He can play havoc with our feeble intellects; and one of the favorite artifices of this Evil One is to convince us that ours isn't all that feeble after all!

Some there are (rationalists and atheists being good examples) who scoff at Catholics and their mysteries which, according to these scoffers, conflict with reason. This is absolutely untrue, for our supernatural mysteries do not conflict with reason; they are simply above reason. Take the most simple and unlearned Catholic, one whose reason is aided by a deep and lively faith. Such a person actually has such a highly developed reasoning power that he has reached the following conclusions: human reason because of our tainted nature is very fallible and unreliable, and consequently there simply must be some truths above and beyond its grasp. My inability to grasp them fully is to be ascribed to my imperfect reason and not to the fact that the mysteries "conflict with reason." The scoffer, the one who prides himself on his great prowess at reasoning, actually has not yet even reached this elementary level of ability to reason!

*****

5. THE TWO FACES OF HERESY

"The Jansenist tendency," says Addis and Arnold's Catholic Dictionary, "displayed itself in so many ways, in attempts to correct doctrines, devotions, discipline...that it is no easy matter to decide where the reproach of Jansenism was deserved."(8) And also: "It must be remembered that the work of the Jansenist

writers was very far from being wholly evil. Arnauld and his friends defended many Catholic doctrines against the Calvinists."(9) Let us now, touching on the fourth point in Fr.Fahey's analysis, consider why it is that there is always a partial truth in all heresies.

Obviously Satan will not take the trouble carefully to plant the seeds of heresy in a man's mind, and then allow him to start off in his "career" attacking every Catholic doctrine in sight. Such a course would gain the heretic no adherents whatsoever from among those who are still faithful Catholics, and these, of course, are the very ones Satan is after primarily, or at least the ones that offer him the greatest obstacles. So, if a heresy is to be successful it must be a good admixture of sound Catholic doctrine and error. It is the 1% error in the mixture that the Evil One will settle for, at least in the very beginning.

"In their writings and addresses," says St. Pius X of the Modernists, "they seem not infrequently to advocate now one doctrine, now another, so that one would be disposed to regard them as vague in their ideas...Hence in their books you find some things which might very well be expressed by a Catholic, but on the next page you find other things which might have been dictated by a rationalist. When they write history, they make no mention of the divinity of Christ, but when they are in the pulpit they profess it clearly. Again, when they write history they pay no heed to the fathers and the councils, but when they catechize the people, they cite them respectfully."(10)

What the heretic advances must always appear plausible. Since the deception is a gradual process, at the very outset his teachings must at least have the semblance of orthodoxy. It goes without saying that someone who tries to promote a palpable absurdity will scarcely be doing Satan's work. The Ancient Enemy knows that our darkened intellects are easy prey for his snares, but he also knows that there is a limit even to our stupidity. Several years ago, for example, some unsolicited literature arrived in the mail, postmarked Old Town, Maine. The sender's name was John Baptist Baker, and in perusing this literature it soon became clear to me that he believed himself to be the 20th century's John THE Baptist, His key "dogma" was that Fr. Coughlin is the third person of the Blessed Trinity. Too insane to fall under the category of blasphemy, this "dogma" certainly was not being used by Satan for the purpose of spreading heresy -- not even in Maine.

Lastly, it would be a mistake to suppose that the heretic will exhibit no piety or good qualities whatsoever. Someone who is a great exponent of Our Lady, for example, or a great defender of traditional Catholicism might be such <u>only ostensibly</u>. If, although sounding orthodox enough, he is nevertheless subtly disseminating error and creating confusion, such a person can do incalculable harm. Many sincere adherents will see and hear only the wholesome things and fail to recognize the errors until they have become hopelessly enmeshed in them. "Discord of thought and will," according to St. Pius X, "is the sure mark of error."(11) Needless to say, then, where there is discord and confusion there is also bound to be error; and unadulterated Catholic orthodoxy as well as true piety and devotion to the Mother of God are in reality far removed, regardless of the outward appearances.

*****

6. AN IMPORTANT PAIR OF TRUTHS

Having seen above how heresies arise through the disturbance of the harmonious equilibrium existing between two related truths--affirming and overemphasizing one truth at the expense of the other--, let us now consider two truths which easily lend themselves to this pattern of heresy. A chief reason why this particular pair of truths is a likely target for Satan's efforts is that each truth is in itself a supernatural mystery, and fully reconciling how <u>both</u> are true at the same time is far, far above the grasp of reason. These two truths are: (A) Christ died for all men; (B) Not all men are saved, but only many.

*****

7. TRUTH (A): CHRIST DIED FOR ALL MEN

When we say that "Christ died for all men," what we mean is that by His Death on the Cross Our Lord <u>redeemed</u> all mankind. Associated with this first truth, then, is a key word: <u>Redemption</u>. Going back to its original derivation, or etymology, we learn that this word <u>redemption</u> means literally a ransom, or buying back, or paying the price for. "You were not redeemed with corruptible things as gold or silver," says St. Peter, "but with the precious blood of Christ."(12)

The sin of Adam was a "race" sin in that its effects are felt by the entire <u>human race</u>. Original Sin and all its consequences--namely, the darkening of the intellect, the weakening of the will, suffering and death, and, most serious of all, the loss of sanctifying grace -- are transmitted at birth, as though through the blood, to every man born into the world. By the very fact he is a human being each man is originally tainted with this sin, and he must carry with him throughout his lifetime its pernicious effects; and thus in every sense of the word Original Sin is <u>hereditary</u>. Exactly why and how Adam's sin became an affair of the whole human race we cannot fully understand, as it is indeed, in a sense, a mystery.

Jesus Christ, the God-Man, by His Passion and Death "<u>purchased</u> for us the rewards of eternal life"; He <u>ransomed</u> us from the captivity of the original sin (but not from its effects) and from all sin. That is to say, He as man could suffer and die as other men; but as God His Sacrifice was infinite, just as the required ransom was infinite. Because of the infinite dignity of The One Who is outraged by sin, all sin demands an infinite atonement or expiation. And so, the ransom, or Redemption, like Adam's original sin, was absolutely <u>universal</u> in its scope. Both were "race" acts having their effects--the one damaging, the other repairing--on the <u>collectivity</u> of mankind.

Some other key words associated with this first truth, then, are: <u>human race</u>, <u>collectively</u>, and <u>universally</u>. And next we come upon the

word sufficiency. Christ's Death was sufficient remedy and ransom for all. No more (and, of course, no less) than some atoning act of the God-Man was needed to repair the infinite outrage of sin, as we have seen. "Christ by His Passion delivered us from our sins causally," says St. Thomas, "that is, by setting up the cause of our deliverance, from which cause all sins whatsoever, past, present, or to come, could be forgiven : just as if a doctor were to prepare a medicine by which all sicknesses can be cured, even in the future."(13) Indeed "Christ died for all men," but only, as St. Thomas explains, in this sense of sufficiency.

No sooner did our first parents fall than God promised them He would send His Redeemer for the human race (14). This promise and its fulfillment by His only begotten Son were manifestations of the infinite mercy of God. Not owing us anything on this score, there was no justice involved here, but only God's mercy. In fine, this first truth we have been discussing, that Christ died for all men, has these related sub-concepts: Redemption, human race, collectively, universally, infinite mercy, and sufficiency.

*****

8. TRUTH (B): ONLY MANY ARE SAVED

Exploring the second truth, namely, that only many men are saved, we encounter a different set of key concepts. First of all, salvation. Not all men attain (or will attain) eternal happiness in heaven, or salvation, but only many. Salvation, therefore, in actuality does not pertain to the human race on a universal and collective basis, but it pertains to many individual souls on a particular basis. Even though Our Divine Redeemer ransomed all men, there are some men who, through their perverse failure to cooperate with God's Will and His grace, effectively nullify for themselves the benefits of this Purchase. Here again is a profound mystery beyond our ken : "the mystery of iniquity"(15).

Suppose (by way of analogy) you have a friend who, for some reason, has been imprisoned. To obtain his release from his jail cell you generously go ahead and put up the required amount of bail; in other words, you pay the price of his ransom. You have done all that lay within your power and, inasmuch as you put up the correct amount, what you have done is sufficient for his obtaining his freedom (at least for the time being). You have thus "redeemed" your friend, and this was an act of "mercy" on your part because you did not owe this to him. Suppose, however, that he obstinately refuses to budge from his cell and chooses to remain right there in his misery instead of going free. Clearly your attempt to "save" him has not been at all effective. This is entirely his own doing and certainly not your fault; in fact it is an actual rebuff to your goodness. Lastly, just why he wishes to stay incarcerated is a "mystery" to you.

This analogy illustrates (among other things) the idea of efficacy or effectiveness. Christ's Death, though sufficient for all men in the sense noted above, is not efficacious or effective for the salvation of all, but only of many.

And finally, the attribute of God which is most closely associated with this second truth is His infinite justice. "Then shall the king say to them that shall be on his right hand : 'Come, ye blessed of my Father, possess you the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world.' ... Then shall he say to them also that shall be on his left hand: 'Depart from me, you cursed, into everlasting fire which was prepared for the devil and his angels.'"(16)

In contradistinction to the list of sub-concepts related to truth (A) which were enumerated earlier, we have these key concepts related to this second truth (B), that only many are saved: Salvation, many souls, individually, particularly, infinite justice, and efficacy.

*****

9. SUMMARY OF THE PRECEDING TWO SECTIONS

Now for each of these two main truths we have been discussing and contrasting there is ample support by way of passages that may be found in Holy Scripture. Of course, no matter how many passages we may find which speak about "all men" (and are thus referring to some aspect of the first truth), the fulness and integrity of the second truth are nowise diminished thereby. Never can these two truths conflict with each other, even though, because they are veiled in mystery, we are not able to reconcile them fully. What we must do is affirm both, without the exaggeration or diminution of either, just as the Council of Trent does in this single sentence which is elegant because of its terseness: "But, though He died for all, yet not all receive the benefit of His death, but those only unto whom the merit of His passion is communicated."(17) In affirming both truths this decree also distinguishes between the two. The following table summarizes the gist of this discussion:

Column A	Column B
CHRIST DIED FOR ALL	ONLY MANY ARE SAVED
REDEMPTION of the human race,	SALVATION of many souls,
collectively,	individually,
universally,	particularly,
showing God's infinite mercy	showing God's infinite justice
and related to the sufficiency aspect of Christ's Death.	and related to the efficacy aspect of Christ's Death.

*****

10. THE FIRST APPROACH TO HERESY: CALVINISM AND JANSENISM

The reason for studying these two truths in such detail in the preceding sections is that we now wish to show that there are basically two principal root heresies connected with them. That is, one can overaffirm either one of these two main truths (and the sub-concepts related to it) to the extent that all the sub-concepts related to the other truth become dwarfed, and then finally this other truth is altogether denied.

In this section let us examine the conse-

quences of magnifying truth (B), that only many are saved. As a start, we shall select from Column B the sub-concept infinite justice. To dwell too much on the thought of God's justice, weighing this idea from every angle and becoming entirely preoccupied with it, will eventually impress upon us a very twisted notion of a stern, relentless God; especially if we never balance our meditation with reflections on the complementary attribute of God's mercy. In fact, in this process we would necessarily and correspondingly get a very stunted idea of the mercy of God. And once the harmonious equilibrium of these two attributes of God becomes disturbed (only in our minds, of course), all the other sub-concepts in Column B, as if by chain effect, become distorted by overemphasis, while their counterparts, the corresponding sub-concepts in Column A, again as if by chain effect, become distorted by underemphasis. Inevitably and finally truth (A) will be denied.

The whole process just described actually took place with the Calvinist and Jansenist heresies. As was mentioned earlier (in passing), the Jansenists opposed the Calvinists on many points. On several ideas, however, the Jansenists actually followed and had a meeting of the minds with the Calvinists. Both denied the freedom of the will; both had perverted doctrines on predestination; and both arrived at precisely the same heretical denial of our truth (A), claiming that Christ did not die for all men. Though it is impossible to reconstruct the exact pattern of thought that led to this ultimate denial, it can be said with certainty that the origin may be traced to the affirming and then the overaffirming of some element in Column B, or perhaps some idea that belongs in Column B, but which we have overlooked.

We know, for example, that their overall view of things in general could be termed aptly a glum and pessimistic one. (Even today when we hear "Jansenist" the picture of an austere, unbending old sourpuss comes to our minds.) This mentality was undoubtedly the cause (in some cases) and the result (in other cases) of their thinking too frequently and one-sidedly about hell, and about God's justice, and about the truth that only many are saved. Now these are among the most awful and mysterious truths of our Faith, and unfortunately they became obsessions with these heretics of whom we are speaking.

Moving along in Column B, we can understand how the overemphasis of the individual soul's particular relationship with God is related to the above. True indeed that every soul does have a personal relationship--most vital it is!--with Almighty God, but we as Catholics must always be thinking in terms of the Mystical Body. Firstly, we must attend to the strengthening of the bond of our own union with Christ, the Head of the Mystical Body, and with all our fellow-members--in the Church Triumphant, the Church Suffering, and the Church Militant--, and this strengthening is effected principally through frequent reception of the true Body of Christ in the Holy Eucharist.

Our next most important task in life is to assist our fellow-members in the Church Militant in remaining steadfast and becoming even stronger members, and to do what we can to bring outsiders into the fold of the One True Faith. How does one go about fulfilling these vital obligations, especially today when they must be accomplished over the dead bodies of the "ecumenizers"? The answer lies herein : "Deep mystery this," says Pope Pius XII, "subject of inexhaustible meditation : that the salvation of many depends on the prayers and voluntary penances which the members of the Mystical Body of Jesus Christ offer for this intention."(18) These powerful tools not even the "ecumenizers" can thwart!

Getting back to our analysis, as a result of this exaggerated view of the importance of the individual soul's personal relationship with God (and this was manifested in the "private interpretation of Scripture," etc.), we still hear today the expression: "protestant individualism." Needless to say, this overemphasis produced a corresponding neglect of the "human race" aspect of Calvary, leading finally to a denial of the universality of the Redemption. They overlooked the distinction between Redemption and Salvation, and erroneously equated the two. The false equating of these two truths can be done in one of two ways: (1) Take Redemption which embraces all men and make it the measuring stick for Salvation. To get Salvation to be "equal" we must enlarge its scope to include all men, and this is false. Or (2) take Salvation which excludes some men and make it the measuring stick for Redemption. To get Redemption to be "equal" we must reduce its scope to include only many. It was in this latter way that the presently-discussed heresy erred. So obsessed with the idea of the salvation of many, they subtracted from the scope of Redemption, denying its universality.

Always so preoccupied with "the elect" (the Calvinists even formulated rules for detecting them while still on earth!), and stressing so much the efficacy aspect of Calvary, they denied the sufficiency aspect in the process. Not able to understand how any act of an omnipotent God could ever be merely sufficient, they also (and this was predictable) denied the concept of "sufficient grace." All grace coming from God is "sufficient grace" at first; that is, it merely enables the recipient to act. If this grace is followed by and indeed produces the action for which it was intended (and here man's free will enters the picture), then it becomes "efficacious grace." Otherwise it remains merely "sufficient." All this is perfectly analogous to the sufficiency and efficacy aspects of Christ's Death. A doctrine of the Calvinists and the Jansenists was: "it is impossible to resist divine grace." So, in effect they claimed that all grace is by definition efficacious, thereby, as we said above, denying sufficient grace.

Errors multiply quickly in systems of heresy. Having postulated one error, many others must subsequently be postulated to support it. Among the host of errors flowing from this basic heresy under discussion there was the denial of free will and a perverted doctrine of predestination. How these fit into the overall

picture should be apparent to the reader.

When Lucifer first puts a man on the road to heresy he effectively robs him of his ability to reason logically; this he does by hamstringing reason's indispensable handmaid, which is faith. Then after having sent the heretic off on a set of false premises, the Evil One himself assumes the role of handmaid to reason. He returns to the unfortunate heretic his logic, and he aids him in constructing a perfectly logical system of error, each new error and denial flowing consistently and naturally from the preceding ones.

How the principle elucidated by Fr. Denis Fahey works--first affirming and then overaffirming one truth, followed by the negation of its complementary truth--should be clear from the discussion in this section. The Calvinists/Jansenists overemphasized everything listed in Column B: only many are saved, salvation, individual, particular, efficacy, God's justice. As each of these was blown out of proportion, its counterpart in Column A became underplayed. Once the toll was taken on something in Column A, the whole balance of the system became disturbed, almost as though a shock wave had gone through it, and everything in this column became diminished in importance to the vanishing point until finally the key truth at the very top, that Christ died for all men, was shaken to the ground!

*****

11. "FOR ALL MEN" SUBVERTS TRADITION

In a letter to the editor printed in The Wanderer(19), Monsieur Paul Poitevin of Paris, France, opposes the viewpoint of those who question the validity of the mutilation: "for all men," which the subversives substituted in the form for consecrating the wine in place of for many (pro multis). Our Lord, in instituting the Sacrament of the Holy Eucharist, said: This is My Blood...which shall be shed for MANY. Testimony to this form of words is given by the Gospels of both St. Matthew(20) and St.Mark(21). But, aside from this proof from Holy Scripture, there is additional incontestable proof from the liturgical tradition of the Church that the words for many are the true ones, and not for all men.

Long before these Evangelists wrote, as the Holy Apostles traversed their divers paths -- Peter to Antioch and then to Rome, Andrew to Greece and Asia Minor, Thomas into India, Simon into Egypt, etc.-- they quite certainly used and handed down these words, "for many," and not "for all men." That this was the case is evident from the very phenomenon of the different Churches--in Asia, in Africa, in Greece, in Rome, and in all those parts where Christianity first took root-- all unanimously and without exception (but in different languages (22), and this is an important point) using these words: for many. In no case and in no place were the words "for all men" ever used in consecrating the Holy Eucharist during Holy Mass.

This last statement is easily provable, not only from all the earliest liturgical texts still extant(23), but principally from the plain, simple and unquestionable fact that throughout nineteen centuries and right up to the very present (i.e., before the vernacular craze became epidemic) not a single rite of the Catholic Church, not the schismatic Eastern Orthodox Churches, not a single heretical Church even, ever used the words "for all men" in this place. Eight Eastern rites there are in communion with the Holy See, and, as of the first part of this century at least, there were eleven different languages used by these eight rites. Now, in all these rites and in all these languages, and also, of course, in the Latin of the Roman Rite, the formula reads for many.(24)

Albeit many of the other prayers and ceremonies of the Mass differ greatly from liturgy to liturgy--(as Rev.Adrian Fortescue observed, "None of the Eastern Churches ever knew anything of our Roman liturgy. In this matter the different Churches followed their own traditions from the very beginning(25)."), nevertheless while not even aware of what the other rites were doing, all the rites exhibited a remarkable unanimity on this particular point of using "for many."

Now, I ask, whence this universal and immemorial usage of the same identical phraseology? If the proper words are really "for all men," then why did these words not show up at some time, or in some language, or in some country, or in some rite? That is, why didn't they show up until 1967 A.D.? Discussing this very topic, namely, the form for consecrating the wine, Pope Innocent III taught: "Therefore, We believe that the form of words, as is found in the Canon, the Apostles received from Christ, and their successors from them."(26) It was in the year 1202 that Pope Innocent III wrote this, and indeed the "form of words" of which he spoke did not include the bogus "for all men." "The Apostles received from Christ, and their successors from them" : THAT is whence this universal usage of the same identical formula for many!

But let us return to Holy Writ. St.Mark wrote his Gospel at Rome and in Greek (the early Christians, even those at Rome, spoke Greek primarily, and not Latin). It is noteworthy, moreover, that St. Mark is known as "the interpreter of St. Peter," and, according to St. Jerome, Mark wrote down what he had heard from Peter. After having read Mark's account, St. Peter himself approved it and with his authority published it to the Church to be read. All this we know from Tradition.

Beyond a doubt St. Mark knew well the word in Greek for all, for this word appears often enough in his Gospel. In point of fact, it appears in the very sentence immediately preceding the passage in question : "And they all (πάντες) drank of it. And He said to them: This is My Blood of the new testament, which shall be shed for many (πολλῶν) ."(27) Although St. Matthew (who also records these same words for many) was one of The Twelve who were present at the Last Supper, St. Mark was not. How, then, did the latter know what words Christ spoke? (I am speaking now from a purely human viewpoint, for it goes without saying that God is the Author of Holy Scripture(28), and His scribe Mark wrote down exactly what the Holy Ghost wanted put down there.)

The answer is elementary : unhesitatingly

St. Mark knew what words to write, for the simple reason that he had been saying Mass for at least ten years before he actually penned his Gospel. A reliable principle, stated by Fortescue, is applicable here: "A formula constantly heard would soon be considered the right one." (29) Now, if "for all men" is really the correct formula, and if this formula had been constantly heard, and if St. Mark had used this formula in saying Mass, why didn't he write down this formula in his Gospel? And if Christ had really said "for all men," or if He had intended that His words should be construed to mean this, would not St. Peter, of all people, have been aware of this? And wouldn't he, Peter, have seen to it that Mark did set down correctly so important a point, in so important a place: the form for the Most Holy Sacrament?

(By the way, it is no use to argue that only Sts. Mark and Matthew record these words for many, while Sts. Luke and Paul omit them. As St. Thomas points out, all the Evangelists did not necessarily intend "to hand down the forms and rites of sacraments, but to narrate the sayings and deeds of the Lord(30)." What is important is that none records "for all men.")

*****

12. "FOR ALL MEN" SUBVERTS SACRAMENTAL THEOLOGY AS EXPLAINED BY POPES, DOCTORS, AND TRENT

Aside from these historical, liturgical, and Scriptural proofs, there is an important theological reason why for many is the proper form. In this place Our Lord was referring to the efficacy, not the sufficiency, aspect of His Death. This is the explanation of Pope Innocent III (31), Pope Benedict XIV (32), the Doctors St. Thomas Aquinas (33) and St. Alphonsus (34), and the Catechism of the Council of Trent (35). Here, for example, is the exposition of St. Alphonsus: "The words Pro vobis et pro multis ('For you and for many') are used to distinguish the virtue of the blood of Christ from its fruits; for the blood of our Saviour is of sufficient value to save all men, but its fruits are applicable only to a certain number and not to all, and this is their own fault. Or, as the theologians say, this precious blood is (in itself) sufficiently (sufficienter) able to save all men, but (on our part) effectually (efficaciter) it does not save all-- it saves only those who cooperate with grace. This is the explanation of St. Thomas, as quoted by Benedict XIV."(36) Thus St. Alphonsus Liguori.

Therefore these words for many in this place mean those for whom Christ's Blood was efficaciously shed; that is, the elect, those who when they die are living members of Christ's Mystical Body (a "living" member of the Mystical Body is any person in the state of sanctifying grace), and who will consequently remain forever in the Mystical Body, perhaps at first as members of the Church Suffering in purgatory, but ultimately as saints in the Church Triumphant. In studying this matter it is essential to bear in mind that in speaking these words Christ was instituting the Sacrament of the Holy Eucharist, and this Sacrament is NOT for all men, but only for those many who are united to Him as members, living members, of His Mystical Body.

The heading atop Monsieur Poitevin's letter (mentioned earlier) reads: The Church Cannot Err on the Mass. Quite true! Could She have erred for over nineteen centuries in using for many? The reader is aware that we are not discussing here whether or not this mutilation: "for all men" is invalid. The lengthy theological argumentation along these lines has been presented elsewhere(37). That this change is wrong and that it is subversive of Tradition has been shown here. There are "traditional" Catholics who from the beginning have vehemently resisted the very supposition that this mutilation could even possibly be invalid. Will they agree at least that it is a flagitious departure from Tradition, these "traditional" Catholics? Why do they not oppose this innovation at least on that score, instead of defending it?

"They exercise all their ingenuity in diminishing the force and falsifying the character of tradition, so as to rob it of all its weight. But for Catholics, the Second Council of Nicaea will always have the force of law, where it condemns those 'who dare, after the impious fashion of heretics, to deride the ecclesiastical traditions, to invent novelties of some kind...or endeavor by malice or craft to overthrow any of the legitimate traditions of the Catholic Church.'"(38) Can't these "traditionalists" see that these words, penned by St. Pius X against the Modernists, apply with equal suitability and vigor against the present-day destroyers?

Instead of deriding and castigating those of us who will not brook such subversion of Tradition, why do not these "traditionalists" help us do battle against those malefactors who heap contempt on venerated customs, "to destroy which is a species of heresy," in the words of the Doctor St. Anselm(39)?

*****

13. LITURGICAL TAMPERING TO PROMOTE HERESY

Knowing well the axiom that "the law of prayer is the law of belief," organized heretics always single out the liturgy as a prime area with which to tamper. Whenever seemingly pointless and uncalled-for innovations appear in the liturgy it is always a danger signal, because the truth is that they are never really pointless at all. On the contrary, such innovations are made with design. Just as Luther, Cranmer, the Jansenists, etc., all tampered with the liturgy in order to promote heresy, so also (I am convinced) this present change, "for all men," was introduced for the purpose of promoting heresy. (More on this in the next issue.)

Although he is dead wrong in the ultimate point he is trying to make, Monsieur Poitevin does, however, illustrate the principle just stated, by showing how the Jansenists tried to change the liturgy to reflect one of their heresies. "Besides," he writes, "I cannot understand how the for all men translation can raise the anger of Catholics accustomed to read in St.Paul that 'As by the fault of one man all men were condemned, by the sacrifice of one man all were procured a life-giving justification.'(Rom.5,18) In the 18th century France, bilingual Missals for the use of laymen, published by the Jansenists, gave for pro multis: pour plusieurs, that is, for a certain number, for some only...and this translation

was considered as leading to heresy and rightly." Now, as regards these words for many one can wander from the path of truth in two ways, just as a tightrope walker can lose his balance by leaning too far either to the right or to the left. (This, incidentally, is analogous to the two ways of falling into heresy on a pair of truths, by exaggerating one or the other of them.)

M. Poitevin himself points out the first way one can err. This may be termed an error by way of subtraction. To bring home the point very clearly it will be convenient to fall back upon Poitevin's native language. In the various French-language New Testaments I consulted I found two different ways that these words for many were expressed: pour une multitude and pour un grand nombre. Both these translations convey the proper meaning or sense of for many, the latter rendition meaning literally: "for a large number." Quite obviously the Jansenists' use of pour plusieurs (for a few, several,etc.) was a false rendering, from the evident fact that few is the antithesis of many. In point of fact a synonym in French for plusieurs is un petit nombre (a small number), which lucidly demonstrates its exact opposition to the correct un grand nombre. Thus for the Jansenists to say pour plusieurs diminished the scope of and took away from the concept of many, which is why I called it an error of subtraction.

Equally wrong and dangerous is it to err by way of addition; and this is to fall off the other side of the tightrope, as it were. To say all men is to mutilate the meaning of many by adding to its scope. The truth, needless to say, is in between plusieurs and all men, in these divinely spoken words: "for many." Those of us who are still Catholics will never accept a counterfeited Holy Writ, no matter who "approves" the bogus wares. "The Holy Ghost," said St. Teresa of Avila, "never inspires anything that is not conformable to Holy Writ. If there were the slightest divergence, that, alone by itself, would suffice to prove so evidently the work of the Evil One that were the whole world to assure me it was the Holy Ghost, I would never believe it."(40)

What is unjust and, in fact, a calumny in M. Poitevin's letter is his innuendo that by insisting on for many we are in the same category as the heretical Jansenists. What priest has ever fallen into heresy by pronouncing those sacred words, pro multis, while offering the Holy Sacrifice? What Catholic has become a heretic by studying and adhering to the teachings of the Popes and Doctors of the Church regarding these words for many?

Since M. Poitevin so readily grasps the Jansenist attack on orthodoxy by tampering with these words, subtracting from their meaning, why cannot he see the danger of adding to their meaning? Knowing the Jansenists and their heterodox tenets about the predestined and their denial that Christ died for all, no great genius is required to see what they were driving at with their pour plusieurs. His observation that this version "was considered as leading to heresy" is not quite correct. Rather should it be said that it reflected the heresies they were already promoting. What heresy, already being promoted now, does this present change of words "For all men" reflect?

--P.H.O.

INTERDVM is published occasionally and is circulated on an issue-by-issue basis. Each issue is sent to those only who have ordered it in advance. IF YOU WISH TO RECEIVE Issue No. 2, please send me now a self-addressed, stamped (6¢) envelope--a large #10 "business size"--and 50¢ in coin(s) or by check, but not in stamps. Additional stamped envelopes addressed to your friends may be enclosed; two such gift copies plus your own copy for $1. Mail to: Patrick Henry Omlor, Box R, Menlo Park, California 94025.

PLEASE NOTE--IMPORTANT! Since requests still are coming in for this present issue, when you order the forthcoming issue please specify clearly: "Issue No. 2." Otherwise there will be some confusion!

EXTRA COPIES OF THIS ISSUE... When you order Issue No. 2, you may at the same time wish to obtain extra copies of Issue No. 1. The price scale is as follows: single copy for 50¢; 3 for $1; 12 for $2; 25 for $3; 50 for $5; 100 for $10. These prices include postage and handling. All must go to the same address.

FOOTNOTES

(1) Summa Theologica, Part II-II, Q. 11, Art. 1.

(2) Quoted in John L. Stoddard's Lectures, vol. 6, p. 227.

(3) Vol. 7, p. 256, 1910 edition.

(4) The Mystical Body of Christ in the Modern World, p. 152.

(5) Ibid.

(6) Luke 17:5.

(7) Part II, Chap. 4, Q. XLI.

(8) Page 465, 1884 edition.

(9) Pages 467-8.

(10) Encyclical Pascendi Dominici Gregis.

(11) Encyclical Editae Saepe.

(12) I Peter 1:18-19.

(13) Summa Theologica, Part III, Q. 49, Art.2.

(14) Genesis 3:15.

(15) II Thess. 2:7.

(16) Matt. 25:34,41.

(17) Session VI, Chap. 3.

(18) Encyclical Mystici Corporis Christi.

(19) Issue of Sept. 11, 1969.

(20) Matt. 26:28.

(21) Mark 14:24.

(22) At least in Aramean (Syro-Chaldaic), Greek and Latin (the three languages of the inscription of the Cross, by the way). Whether in addition to these the Apostles also celebrated Mass in the languages of the different nations cannot be said with certainty. See Rev. Nicholas Gihr, The Holy Sacrifice of the Mass, p. 319, n. 2.

(23) For the English translations of most of these texts see L. Duchesne, Christian Worship : Its Origin and Evolution, and also Archdale A. King, The Rites of Eastern Christendom. The Greek texts of most of these ancient liturgies may be found in F. E. Brightman, Liturgies Eastern and Western, Oxford, 1896.

(24) Donald Attwater, Eastern Catholic Worship, gives the complete texts of the Canons presently in use in all these Eastern rites, which are the Byzantine, Armenian, Coptic, Ethiopic, Maronite, Syrian, Chaldean and Malabarese.

(25) The Orthodox Eastern Church, p. 111.

(26) Letter Cum Marthae circa. See Denzinger, no.783, edition 32.

(27) Mark 14:23-4.

(28) Defined by the Council of Trent, Sess. 4. Those who hold otherwise are again condemned in "The Syllabus of Errors of the Modernists" of St. Pius X, (#9).

(29) The Mass : A Study of the Roman Liturgy, p. 51.

(30) IV. Sent., dist. 8, Q. 2, Art.2, q. 1, ad 1.

(31) De Sacro Altaris Mysterio, Book IV, Ch. XLI : "Qui pro multis effundetur in remissionem peccatorum. Pro solis praedestinatis effusus est, quantum ad efficientiam. Sed pro cunctis hominibus est effusus quantum ad sufficientiam."

(32) De Sacrosancto Missae Sacrificio, Book II, Ch. XV, par.11 : "Itaque dicimus Christi Sanguinem fusum esse pro omnibus ... fusum autem pro omnibus quoad sufficientiam, et pro solis electis quoad efficaciam, ut bene explicat D. Thomas."

(33) Summa Theologica, III, Q. 78, Art.3, ad 8. Also in IV Sent., dist.8, Q.2, Art.2, q.3, ad 7. Also in In Epistolam I ad Corinthios, Caput XI, lecture 6.

(34) Treatise on the Holy Eucharist, p.44 of the edition published by the Redemptorist Fathers, 1934, translated by Rev. Eugene Grimm, C.SS.R.

(35) Part II, Ch.4, Q. XXIV: "With reason, therefore, were the words 'for all' NOT used, as in this place the fruits of the Passion are alone spoken of, and to the elect only did His Passion bring the fruit of salvation." (Emphasis added.)

(36) See footnote (34).

(37) P. H. Omlor, Questioning The Validity of the Masses using The New, All-English Canon, 3rd edition, Athanasius Press, 311 N. 4th St., Brainerd, Minn. 56401, $1. See also "An Answer to the Defenders of the New English Canons," by Rev. L.S. Brey, 8300 W. Denver Ave., Milwaukee, Wis. 53223. Also in the Oct. 1969 issue of Homiletic and Pastoral Review an excellent letter to the editor by Rev.Dismas Treder, O.F.M.

(38) Encyclical Pascendi Dominici Gregis.

(39) De nuptiis consanguineorum, ch. 1. This from St. Anselm is quoted approvingly by Pope St. Pius X in his encyclical Communium Rerum.

(40) Quoted in Christendom, Feb. '68.

My gratitude to all you initial readers, who thereby have helped start INTERDVM. Though I can't reply to very many, please continue to write. Special thanks to those very many who wrote, saying they are praying for me.